

Application No.: 09/752,123

Docket No.: JCLA6706

REMARKS**Present Status of the Application**

The Office Action objected the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), and objected claims 2, 6, 12 because of some informalities, claims 6, 9, 12 for insufficient antecedent basis, and claims 10, 11 for unclear. Further, the Office Action rejected claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action also rejected claims 2, 6 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over York (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,881) in view of Zolnowsky (U.S. Patent No. 4,729,094). After entering amendment, applicant respectfully traverses the objections and rejections, and reconsideration of claims 2 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Objections

Claims 2 and 6 are amended to overcome the objections made in the Office Action. Further, claims 9-12 are cancelled.

The drawings are amended according to 5th paragraph in the DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS of the specification. Accordingly, no new matter is added therein.

Application No.: 09/752,123

Docket No.: JCLA6706

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

[35 USC 101 discussion]

The Office Action rejected claims 9-12 under 35 USC 101. To overcome the rejection, the Applicants cancelled claims 9-12.

[35 USC 103 discussion]

The Office Action rejected claims 2 and 6 under 35 USC 103(a).

After entering the amendment in the claims, independent claims 2 and 6 are patentable over York in view of Zolnowsky at least because combination of the cited references does not teach the feature of "...a number of word data that needs to be transmitted is determined by the coprocessor number field and the coprocessor register field..." as claimed in claims 2 and 6.

More specifically, the Office Action asserted that York has not taught a plurality of coprocessors, each of the coprocessors coupled to the CPU and memory unit, and the indicating field including a coprocessor number field for storing information about a specific coprocessor to be activated, wherein the coprocessor number field determines one of the coprocessors to be activated, however, Zolnowsky has taught the related concept. The Office Action asserted that Fig. 3 of Zolnowsky has a general instruction, for instance, including a CP =ID field (coprocessor ID).

However, both of the citations do not teach to determine a number of word data that needs to be transmitted by the coprocessor number field and the coprocessor register field, which is claimed in claims 2 and 6 of the present invention. Therefore, although the two citations are

Application No.: 09/752,123

Docket No.: JCLA6706

combined together, no any suggestions are made to determine a number of word data that needs to be transmitted by the coprocessor ID. Accordingly, those with ordinary skill cannot be taught to use the ID field in the Zolnowsky for determining a number of word data that needs to be transmitted, which is claimed in the present invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 2 and 6 patently define over the prior art reference, and should be allowed.

Application No.: 09/752,123

Docket No.: JCLA6706


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 2 and 6 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: 2/1/2005

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS


Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330